

REGULAR MEETING OF THE TIPPECANOE COUNTY DRAINAGE BOARD HELD SEPTEMBER 18, 1974

The regular meeting of the Tippecanoe County Drainage Board was held in the County Commissioner's Room in the Tippecanoe County Court House at 9:00 a.m., on September 18th, 1974. The following members were present: Robert F. Fields, Bruce Osborn, Edward Shaw, A. D. Ruth, Jr., Fred Hoffman, and Gladys Ridder.

Signing of
Minutes

Upon the reading of the minutes of the July 3, 1974 drainage board meeting (there was no meeting in August) Robert Fields moved to accept the minutes as read. The motion was seconded by Bruce Osborn and made unanimous by Edward Shaw.

9:00 a.m.
Maintenance-
Ann Montgomery
ditch

At 9:00 a.m., the Engineer opened the maintenance hearing on the Ann Montgomery Legal drain by reading his report and making his recommendations to the Board. In attendance were: Robert Stradling, Neal Simison, Robert L. Plaster, Larry Treece, Lucille Banes Williams, Keith McMillin, Nyle Royce, Harley W. Rust and Ralph H. Crowder. Robert Stradling said he had overlaps with other ditches. Mr. Ruth assured him after receiving Mr. Stradling's letter to that affect, the acreage in the Ann Montgomery ditch had been deleted. Mr. Ralph Crowder had been in the Surveyor's office seeking assistance in correcting the amount of acreage assessed against his land and upon recommendation of the Engineer, the Board his total acres assessed as fifty (50) instead of the original eighty five (85). Mr. Ruth reported that he had had complaints from the officers of the Little Wea Conservancy District that the Ann Montgomery ditch was dumping mud deposits into the Little Wea and causing problems. Larry Treece wanted the Board to assure him that before any monies were spent on the repair of this ditch that the Engineer check the cause for the needed repair and if it was a man made error of negligence in keeping the ditch clean, not to use any of this money to correct the problem. The Board told him that it was not easy to determine the cause but that they would instruct the Engineer to check as best he could. With most of those present in favor of establishing a maintenance fund Robert Fields moved to establish a \$ 1.00 per acre assessment maintenance fund. The motion was seconded by Bruce Osborn and made unanimous by Edward Shaw.

9:30 a.m.
Informal hearing
E. Branch of
J. McFarland
ditch

At 9:30 a.m., the Board held an informal hearing on the reconstruction of the East branch of the John McFarland ditch. Mr. Charles Vaughan had asked the Engineer to do some ground work and give them an estimate of what it would cost to reconstruct the East branch of the John McFarland legal drain. Those in attendance were: Gene L. Rooze, Russell Slayton, Ralph Manier, O. C. Greives, Chas. R. Vaughan and H. Franklin Dunwoody. Mr. Ruth told them that a figure of \$ 20.00 per acre was a pretty good estimate of the cost of reconstruction for that branch. Some were in favor but others felt that constructing an open ditch would give them no relief. One said that Pine Creek, the outlet for the McFarland ditch, was so in need of dredging that no matter what was done to increase the flow of water without an outlet no relief would be given. A waterway with possible financial help from the SCS office was suggested but Mr. Vaughan felt that although it would probably benefit him, it would only dump more water onto his neighbor. The Engineer felt there was need of more time to study the problem further. Upon motion of Bruce Osborn, seconded by Robert Fields and made unanimous by Edward Shaw to continue this meeting for ninety days.

10:00 a.m.
Elmer Thomas
Reconstruction
hearing

The Engineer opened the reconstruction hearing on the Elmer Thomas ditch by reading his report and making his recommendations to the Board. He pointed out the difference in price since his first estimate. Because of building costs, materials, etc. the original figure was no longer valid. Those in attendance were: Mr. & Mrs. Lyle Loomis, E. E. & Robert Franklin, Dale Remaly, Earl Ziegler, Mr. & Mrs. Robert Buker, Gordon DeBoy, Mr. Floyd. Mr. Lyle Loomis said after Mr. Gib Connelly had cleared his wooded area the swamp became decidedly worse. His one time beautiful home and garden were no longer beautiful for the garden was now swamp. He felt it could be drained and when he retired he could again have his lovely home. No amount of money to drain the area would seem too high. Mr. Floyd said he was in the exact same position as Mr. Loomis as he, too, had lost his garden and would surely be in favor of reconstruction of the Elmer Thomas ditch if it would bring he and his neighbors relief. Mr. Buker said he had purchased the Connelly property and had need of tilting the soil but with a swamp he could not farm his land. Mr. Osborn asked Mr. Buker since he would no doubt benefit more than others would he be willing to accept more of the cost. Mr. Buker said he certainly would. And Mr. Osborn said "how much" and Mr. Buker said "double". Gordon DeBoy said his acreage was in error that 43 acres couldn't drain this way and the Board asked the Surveyor if he would take elevations and determine the correct assessment. Mr. Ruth told all those present that he wanted it understood that even if the swamp was drained, the land was in the flood plane and could not be used for building.

** Mr. E. E. Franklin and his son Robert both explained that their dam did not hold back any of the water that was now so controversial. At one time there was a dam in their area and being very poorly constructed was taken out by a flood, but after it was out the problem of the swampy area was still there. Mr. Williams and Mr. Ziegler spoke out against the reconstruction and felt some were carrying the blunt of the assessment while others were benefitting with a lesser assessment.

After hearing all the pros and cons, Mr. Bruce Osborn said he could not possibly vote for the reconstruction as the assessment role is now set up. He asked the Engineer to re-allot the amount of money to build the ditch according to the individual benefits. Then a new hearing would be held. The entire Board felt this would be more fair so the hearing was continued.

** Mr. Dale Remaly said there were some fallen logs and quite a baracade of brush on the John Garrott property and asked the Engineer to check it out for he felt those logs surely were causing some of the problems. Dale said his portion of the assessment was well over four thousand dollars and he doubted if he could ever benefit to that extent but he knew how much it would help others and he'd like to feel when he left this world he would have left it a little better than when he came into it, so he would vote for the reconstruction.

11:00 a.m.
Maintenance
hearing-E. F.
Haywood ditch

The Engineer opened the maintenance hearing on the E. F. Haywood ditch by reading the minutes of the 1972 and 1973 hearings on this ditch. In those minutes the people present had said they would take care of their own ditch and would bring it up into good repair. When asked what had been done in the last two years, Mr. Joe Rund said, "Nothing, only more mud has piled up." Mr. James Kellerman said he was in favor of a maintenance fund because all farmers know that if there's no drainage there's no farming. As in the two years before the Moore's and the Kirkpatrick's were much opposed to any maintenance assessment. Mr. Moore asked the attorney for a copy of the law that instructed this Board to set up a maintenance fund and Mr. Hoffman, the County Attorney, provided him with same. Mr. Joe Ratcliff attacked the Board by saying, "I talked to a fellow who said he'd paid money into the county for a ditch but when he came in to ask for help on his ditch, he was told there wasn't any money. What did you fellas do with the money?" "Spend it on Welfare."

Those in attendance were: Robert W. and Keltie Kirkpatrick, Robert and Jane Moore, Joe Ratcliff, Frank Royer, John Kerkhoff, Joe Rund, James S. Kellerman. Mr. Ruth explained the need for a dollar per acre assessment. In cases where there's been a lesser assessment it has not proven adequate. With those against the assessment (or ever having a maintenance fund established) so vehement in their demands, the Board moved to set this ditch up for vacation, with the exception of Robert Fields. The Secretary was instructed to notify all persons on the ditch of a hearing to vacate. The Attorney advised the Secretary to set up the hearing as to vacate or establish a maintenance fund.

Mr. R. M. Stoepfelwerth, John Gambs and Thomas Schubert came before the Board with their request to empty treated wastewater into the J. B. Anderson ditch.

11:45 a.m.
Meeting with
Clarks Hill
Disposal Plant
Board

September 16, 1974

Mr. Dan Ruth
Tippecanoe County Surveyor
Court House
Lafayette, Indiana 47902

RE: Clarks Hill Wastewater Treatment Plant
Effluent Discharge to Anderson Ditch

Mr. Ruth:

You will find enclosed for your use a location and site plan for the above referenced facility. We have also enclosed the plan and profile of the effluent sewer connection to Anderson Ditch.

The 12-inch effluent sewer from the wastewater treatment plant is proposed to discharge into the existing 30-inch pipe approximately 1100 feet from the existing outfall on Anderson Ditch. We propose to discharge approximately 75,000 gallons per day (0.116cfs) of treated wastewater within the first year after the plant is completed. When the plant is at maximum capacity which is estimated to take approximately 20 years the discharge will be 150,000 gallons per day (0.232 cfs).

The water discharged from the plant is to be better than 98 per cent pure. The plant is designed to produce an effluent containing a effluent biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of 5 mg/1 and suspended solids (SS) of 8 mg/1. The plant meets all requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board.

If you have any questions regarding the proposal to discharge the effluent to Anderson Ditch, please feel free to contact us at any time.

Very truly yours,
STOEPELWERTH AND ASSOCIATES
S/ Thomas M. Schubert, P.E.

TMS/srn

1:30 p.m.
Alvin Pilotte

Attorney Thomas Brooks representing Alvin Pilotte appeared before the Board along with Mr. Pilotte and Robert Lahrman. Mr. Pilotte's complaint was with the Board's having made a waterway through his farm a part of the Ilgenfritz legal drain. The Board had done so because of a petition drawn up by the majority of the neighbors in that area. Mr. Pilotte said he was in Florida when it was done and objected strenuously. The Board listened to his side of the story and then suggested that he bring a petition with the signatures of the proper amount of acreage involved and again the Board would consider removing the addition.

Gary Williby
2:30 p.m.-drainage
study

Professor Spooner from the School of Civil Engineering at Purdue University came before the Board and presented a young student by the name of Gary Williby who had been working for several months on a project involving the ground North of West Lafayette and it's drainage problems. This work was done in response to a request made by Mr. Ruth for a drainage study in this area. Copies of the study were left for the Surveyor's office use. It was beautifully presented and quite an involved study. Professor Spooner also did a presentation on soils and gave the possibilities of future studies on the types of soils etc. He also said all he needed was another student like Gary.

John Fisher
J.Kirkpatrick drain

Mr. John Fisher made a presentation of the philosophy of drainage in the James N. Kirkpatrick Legal drain watershed. He asked the Board only to listen and consider all the possibilities of long range planning-no decisions would be asked of them.

Order & Findings
and
Certificate of
Assessments

Upon the establishment of a maintenancê fund on the Ann Montgomery Ditch, the Board signed the Order and Findings and the Certificate of Assessments. The meeting had lasted until 4:00 p.m., and they gladly adjourned.